UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,657	04/18/2005	Karina Drumm	129402.00201	9864
Raymond A Mi	7590 04/21/201 ller	EXAMINER		
Firm 21269		WOLLENBERGER, LOUIS V		
One Mellon Cer 50th Floor 500		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Pittsburgh, PA	15219	1635		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/511,657	DRUMM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Louis Wollenberger	1635				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (the MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f.).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slaset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause			
(a) $oxtime$ They raise new issues that would require further con		ΓE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	acted claims				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11		cied ciaims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliant / imenament (1 102 02+).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alk		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	swazie ii cuziiiii.co iii a coparate, i	annony mod annonamon	it sallsoming the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 4-6, 9, 16, 94, 95, and 97-99</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefore or on the date of filing a No	atice of Anneal will not	· he entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		,				
11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
	/Louis Wollenberger/					
	Primary Examiner, Art U April 19, 2010	nit 1635				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to the claims filed 4/15/2010 incorporates the limitations of claim 99 into independent claim 1, and therefore, into each claim depending from claim 1. In fact, each of dependent claims 4, 5, and 95 have also been expressly amended with the limitations of former claim 99 such that claims 4 and 5 now require a search and examination of the method of claim 1 wherein the autosomal recessive retinitis pigmentosa or congenitial stationary night blindness is related to angiogenesis and/or neovascularization, retinal pigment epithelium (RPE), neurosensory retina, choroid, or a combination of RPE, neurosensory retina, or choroid. These specific limitations have not been previously searched or examined on the merits in the context of the claimed method and it is not immediately clear that claims 4 and 5 as amended on 4/15/2010 overlap in scope with claims 4 and 5 as previously presented on 11/12/2009. Furthermore, Applicant has also amended dependent claim 95, which is drawn to the method of claim 1, and now requires a search and consideration of a step for diagnosing a subject with autosomal recessive retinitis pigmentosa or congenital stationary night blindness or a predisposition to autosomal recessive retinitis pigmentosa or congenital stationary night blindness, which also has not been previously searched or examined on the merits in the context of the claimed method. Additionally, dependent claim 97, which is drawn to the method of claim 1 further comprising "isolating the target gene," would now require an assessment of not only the genus of target genes that specifically give rise to ARRP and CSNB but also methods of isolating these specific target genes before, after, and/or during the course of the treatment method defined by claim 1.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's arguments accompanying the proposed amendments to the claims are noted but have not been considered because they are directed to the after-final amendments to the claims, 4/15/2010, which have not been entered for the reasons given above.